



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/841,872	04/26/2001	Donal Doherty	1817-0109P	6150
2292	7590	04/28/2006	EXAMINER	
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			AKINTOLA, OLABODE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3624	

DATE MAILED: 04/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/841,872	DOHERTY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Olabode Akintola	3624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 April 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1- 14, 17 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In particular, claims 5, 7, 12 and 14 are unclear, ambiguous and incomprehensible. The claims recite, “prior to transmitting acceptance of the order, the broker computer transmits *merchant computer acceptance*.... to the customer”. It is not clear what the merchant computer acceptance is (page 15, line 8) and what acceptance is transmitted to the merchant (page 15, line 11).

Furthermore, in view of claims 4, 6, 11 and 13 respectively, the claims recite, “ the merchant transmits acceptance order to the broker”, a method step succeeding the steps of claims 5, 7, 12 and 14 as recited above, appear to be logically incorrect, making the claims incomprehensible.

For examining purposes, the claims 5, 7, 12 and 14 would be given its broadest interpretation and would be interpreted as “subsequent to transmitting acceptance of the order, the broker computer transmits merchant computer acceptance.... to the customer” because the

broker computer could not have transmitted merchant computer acceptance of the order to the customer computer without first receiving such acceptance from the merchant computer.

Claim 1 recites the limitation "the merchant computer" on page 13, line 17. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims. Particularly, line 16 on the same page recites "each merchant computer", hence the "merchant computer" in line 17, should read "merchant computers" and "a quotation" should read "quotations".

Claims 2-14, 17 and 36 recite the limitation "the merchant computer". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims.

Claims 2, 3, 4, 6, 9, 10, 11 and 13 recite the limitation "the relevant portion". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims.

Claims 4, 5, 6, 7, 11, 12, 13 and 14 recite the limitation "the order". There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 17-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Functional descriptive material, per se, is not statutory. This is exemplified in *In re Warmerdam* 31 USPQ2d 1754 where the rejection of a claim to a disembodied data structure was affirmed. Thus a claim to a data structure, per se, or other functional descriptive material, including computer programs, per se, is not patent eligible subject matter.

Functional descriptive material claimed in combination with an appropriate computer readable medium to enable the functionality to be realized is patent eligible subject matter if it is capable of producing a useful, concrete and tangible result when used in the computer system. Compare *Warmerdam* to *In re Lowry* 32 USPQ2d 1031 where a memory with a data structure that increased computing efficiency was patentable.

The computer readable medium loaded with a computer program and in association with a computer provides the functional descriptive material in usable form to permit the functionality to be realized with the computer. A program product which does not explicitly include such a medium, a program per se, a signal or other type of transmission media that fails to include the hardware necessary to realize the functionality (e.g., a transmitter or a receiver), and a piece of paper with the functional descriptive material written on it are all examples of media which are not believed to enable the functionality to be realized with the computer.

Claims 18-22, 24, 26, 29-33, 35 and 37: recite computer program per se, which is not patent eligible subject matter based upon the foregoing analysis.

Claims 17, 23, 25, 27, 28, 34, 36 and 38: the disclosed invention is inoperative and therefore lacks utility.

In particular, claims 17, 23, 25, 27, 28, 34, 36 and 38 merely recite an apparatus (a computer) without providing a structure of the apparatus ("means for" corresponds to software program elements and not tangible hardware components of an apparatus) and therefore cannot realize functionality of the recited elements (i.e. functional descriptive material per se) and therefore is rendered inoperative lacking any utility.

Note that a computer (or software program) code cannot by itself perform the underlying function until it is loaded on some computer readable memory and accessed by the computer (or a processor).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 17-21, 25-26, 28-32, 36-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Mandler et al (U.S. Patent No. 5732400) hereinafter referred to as Mandler.

Re claim 17-21: Mandler teaches means for receiving an initial trading request from a customer computer (Col. 4, lines 20-23); means for sending the initial trading request to one or

more merchant computers with a quotation request (Col. 4, lines 26-28); means for receiving quotations from the merchant computer (Col. 4, lines 29-30); means for preparing a proposed trading request from the quotations (Col. 4, lines 29-32); and means for downloading the proposed trading request to the customer computer (Col. 4, lines 29-32). Note that record medium, computer memory and read only memory are all inherent features in a computer apparatus.

Re claims 25- 26 and 36-37: Mandler teaches means for receiving a transaction list from a customer computer (col. 14, lines 9-14); and means for using the transaction list to complete the transaction with the merchant computer for the customer computer (col. 15, lines 47-65).

Re claims 28-32: Mandler teaches means for downloading an initial trading request to the broker computer with a quotation request (Col. 4, lines 20-23); means, on receiving the quotation request as a proposed trading request from the broker computer, to prepare a transaction list (Col. 4, lines 29-32; col. 14, lines 9-14); means for sending the transaction list to the broker computer; and means for completing the transaction (col. 14, lines 6-14; col. 15, lines 47-65). Note that record medium, computer memory and read only memory are all inherent features in a computer apparatus.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are

such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-16, 22-24, 27, 33-35 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mandler et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5732400) (hereinafter referred to as Mandler) in view of Hoffman (U.S. Patent Application No. 20010039529).

Re claims 1 and 8: Mandler teaches the steps of: the customer computer sending an initial trading request to the broker computer; the broker computer sending the initial trading request to each merchant computer with a quotation request; the merchant computer sending the quotation back to the broker computer; the broker computer preparing a proposed trading request from the quotations for the preferred merchants; and the broker computer downloading the proposed trading request to the customer (Col. 4, lines 20-42). Mandler does not explicitly teach the step of: the customer computer sending a list of preferred merchants to the broker computer. Hoffman teaches the step: of the customer computer sending a list of preferred merchants to the broker computer (section [0008][0034]).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Mandler to include the step wherein the customer computer sending a list of preferred merchants to the broker computer as taught by Hoffman so that the customers can establish the identity of merchants they wish to deal with, thereby saving time.

Re claims 3, 4, 6, 10, 11 and 13: Mandler and Hoffman are discussed above.

Furthermore, Mandler teaches the steps wherein the customer computer receives the proposed trading request; the customer computer displays the proposed trading request; the customer computer prepares a transaction list from the proposed trading request; the customer computer sends the transaction list to the broker computer; and the broker computer transmits the relevant portion of the transaction list to the merchant computer (Col. 4, lines 20-42); the merchant computer transmits acceptance of the order, delivery details and a payment request to the broker computer (col. 14, lines 52-57; col. 3, lines 58-65; col. 15, lines 47-65); the broker computer confirms completion to the merchant computer (col. 15, lines 47-65); the broker computer confirms payment with the customer computer; and the broker computer confirms payment to the merchant computer (col. 3, lines 58-65; col. 4, lines 38-42).

Re claims 2 and 9: Mandler and Hoffman are discussed above. Furthermore, Mandler teaches the step wherein the customer computer receives the proposed trading request; the customer computer displays the proposed trading request; the customer computer prepares a transaction list from the proposed trading request (col. 4, lines 20-42). Mandler did not explicitly teach the step: the customer computer sends the relevant portion of the transaction list to the merchant computer. Hoffman teaches the step: the customer computer sends the relevant portion of the transaction list to the merchant computer (sections [0007][0008]). Therefore, it would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Mandler to include the step: the customer computer sends the relevant portion of the transaction list to the merchant computer as taught by Hoffman rather than sending it through the broker as a matter of design choice in the event that the broker computer breaks down.

Re claims 5, 7, 12 and 14: Mandler and Hoffman are discussed above. Furthermore, Mandler teaches the step wherein subsequent to transmitting acceptance of the order, the broker computer transmits merchant computer acceptance, delivery and payment details to the customer computer and on receiving confirmation from the customer computer, transmits the acceptance to the merchant computer (col. 4, lines 20-42; col. 14, lines 52-57; col. 3, lines 58-65; col. 15, lines 47-65)

Re claim 15: Mandler and Hoffman are discussed above. Mandler and Hoffman do not explicitly teach the step in which the preferred merchants are stored in order of customer preference. Official notice is hereby taken that it is old and well known in the art to prioritize the list of merchants according to customer preference. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Mandler in view of Hoffman to include the step in which the preferred merchants are stored in order of customer preference because it greatly improves the system by allowing the customer to prioritize the merchants he/she wants to deal with.

Re claim 16: Mandler and Hoffman are discussed above. Furthermore, Mandler teaches the step in which the broker computer prepares the proposed trading request having regard to pre-established rules agreed with the customer (col. 3, lines 55-58).

Re claims 23, 24, 27, 34, 35 and 38: Mandler is discussed above. Mandler teaches means for storing in a merchant database, a list of merchants for each customer; means for retrieving the list of merchants on receiving the initial trading request; and means for sending the quotation request to the merchant computers (col. 4, lines 20-42). Mandler does not explicitly teach preferred merchants. Hoffman teaches preferred merchant (section [0008][0034]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Mandler to include preferred merchants as taught by Hoffman so that the customers can establish the merchant they wish to deal with, thereby saving time.

Re claim 22 and 33: Mandler and Hoffman are as discussed above. Furthermore, Hoffman teaches electrical carrier signal (section [0006]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Mandler to include electrical carrier signal as taught by Hoffman because it allow the system to communicate wirelessly thereby improving the system.

Conclusion


5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Olabode Akintola whose telephone number is 571-272-3629. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30AM -5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vincent Millin can be reached on 571-272-6747. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3624

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

OA


JAGDISH N. PATEL
PRIMARY EXAMINER